

Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that “taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution.” Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2007). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2007) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division, hereinafter referred to as the Division, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):

- (2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
- (3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.

(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

The narrative and statistical reports contained in the Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the R&O, provide a thorough, concise analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county assessor to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The Property Tax Administrator's opinion of level of value and quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division regarding the assessment activities during the preceding year. This is done in recognition of the fact that the measurement of assessment compliance, in terms of the concepts of actual value and uniformity and proportionality mandated by Nebraska law, requires both statistical and narrative analysis.

The Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

However, just as the valuation of property is sometimes more art than science, a narrative analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio study. There may be instances when the analysis of assessment practices outweighs or limits the reliability of the statistical inferences of central tendency or quality measures. This may require an opinion of the level of value that is not identical to the result of the statistical calculation. The Property Tax Administrator's goal is to provide statistical and narrative analysis of the assessment level and practices to the Commission, providing the Commission with the most complete picture possible of the true level of value and quality of assessment in each county.

The Property Tax Administrator's opinions of level of value and quality of assessment are stated as a single numeric representation for level of value and a simple judgment regarding the quality of assessment practices. Based on the information collected in developing this report the Property Tax Administrator may feel further recommendations must be stated for a county to assist the Commission in determining the level of value and quality of assessment within a county. These opinions are made only after considering all narrative and statistical analysis provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division. An evaluation of these opinions must only be made after considering all other information provided in the R&O.

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.

Table of Contents

Commission Summary

Property Tax Administrator's Opinions and Recommendations

Residential Reports Section

Preliminary Statistical Reports
 Residential Real Property, Qualified
Residential Assessment Actions
Residential Appraisal Information
R&O Statistical Reports
 Residential Real Property, Qualified

Residential Correlation Section

Residential Real Property
 I. Correlation
 II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratios
 IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to
 Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Residential (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

Commercial Reports Section

Preliminary Statistical Reports
 Commercial Real Property, Qualified
Commercial Assessment Actions
Commercial Appraisal Information
R&O Statistical Reports
 Commercial Real Property, Qualified

Commercial Correlation Section

Commercial Real Property
 I. Correlation
 II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratios
 IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to
 Percentage Change in Assessed Value

- V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
- VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
- VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Commercial (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

Agricultural Reports Section

- Preliminary Statistical Reports
 - Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified
- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Appraisal Information
- R&O Statistical Reports
 - Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified

Agricultural Correlation Section

- Agricultural Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratios
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural (What If) Recommendation Statistics if necessary

Special Valuation Section

County Reports Section

- 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2008 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Map Section

Valuation History Chart Section

2008 Commission Summary

19 Colfax

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	168	COD	16.07
Total Sales Price	\$11,910,325	PRD	105.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,892,125	COV	28.84
Total Assessed Value	\$11,507,415	STD	29.37
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,786	Avg. Abs. Dev.	15.62
Avg. Assessed Value	\$68,497	Min	35.37
Median	97.19	Max	364.33
Wgt. Mean	96.77	95% Median C.I.	95.23 to 99.38
Mean	101.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	94.87 to 98.66
		95% Mean C.I.	97.38 to 106.27
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			23.95
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			4.82
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			6.03
Average Assessed Value of the Base			54,782

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	168	97.19	16.07	105.23
2007	188	96.39	15.24	104.78
2006	201	96.60	14.07	103.14
2005	211	97.08	15.46	105.14
2004	279	94.06	18.29	104.28
2003	287	94	20.42	102.69
2002	272	95	23.66	108.24
2001	282	96	23.17	105.37

2008 Commission Summary

19 Colfax

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	7.57
Total Sales Price	\$380,700	PRD	101.49
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$380,700	COV	10.99
Total Assessed Value	\$367,165	STD	10.75
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$34,609	Avg. Abs. Dev.	7.47
Avg. Assessed Value	\$33,379	Min	79.52
Median	98.75	Max	116.55
Wgt. Mean	96.44	95% Median C.I.	86.72 to 112.92
Mean	97.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	88.74 to 104.15
		95% Mean C.I.	90.66 to 105.11
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			9.7
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			1.95
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			0.47
Average Assessed Value of the Base			137,134

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	11	98.75	7.57	101.49
2007	15	98.96	9.86	100.20
2006	30	95.58	24.25	101.85
2005	34	96.47	19.82	100.75
2004	48	97.32	15.42	103.97
2003	45	99	13.33	102.95
2002	55	98	34.11	105.45
2001	42	92	31.46	95.98

2008 Commission Summary

19 Colfax

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	58	COD	14.77
Total Sales Price	\$11,793,802	PRD	98.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,483,111	COV	21.33
Total Assessed Value	\$8,346,105	STD	15.34
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$197,985	Avg. Abs. Dev.	10.60
Avg. Assessed Value	\$143,898	Min	45.93
Median	71.79	Max	134.45
Wgt. Mean	72.68	95% Median C.I.	66.80 to 73.09
Mean	71.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	64.11 to 81.26
		95% Mean C.I.	67.98 to 75.88
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County			66.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period			1.47
% of Value Sold in the Study Period			2.72
Average Assessed Value of the Base			134,361

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	58	71.79	14.77	98.96
2007	60	69.87	16.36	100.08
2006	57	74.91	21.35	100.10
2005	69	76.14	17.39	104.08
2004	68	77.87	16.63	103.38
2003	72	76	14.96	101.3
2002	62	75	16.59	99.5
2001	77	76	20.19	100.82

2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Colfax County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Colfax County is 97% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Colfax County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Colfax County is 99% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Colfax County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Colfax County is 72% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Colfax County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	31.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.02 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	31.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.80 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.45	95% Mean C.I.:	97.24 to 106.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,337,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	19.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,482	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:52

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	23	93.13	99.10	93.35	18.81	106.16	58.44	168.38	83.90 to 106.66	78,611	73,380
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	25	96.44	100.04	95.78	12.42	104.45	71.92	137.46	91.24 to 105.99	73,320	70,229
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	90.97	96.34	91.71	16.39	105.04	76.38	127.75	78.18 to 118.06	56,075	51,429
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	31	96.05	106.69	94.09	21.50	113.40	68.43	364.33	89.43 to 106.42	82,400	77,527
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	105.96	115.62	101.61	23.50	113.79	71.82	180.00	83.54 to 145.78	55,463	56,355
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	98.34	103.46	99.71	18.03	103.76	61.03	193.44	88.40 to 105.93	76,776	76,554
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	94.63	93.46	89.33	15.44	104.62	49.64	136.70	72.71 to 113.23	55,505	49,584
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	34	98.96	98.44	95.51	19.33	103.06	35.37	183.42	87.43 to 103.55	67,570	64,539
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	91	95.35	101.58	94.11	17.60	107.93	58.44	364.33	91.24 to 97.99	75,476	71,032
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	77	98.72	102.63	97.00	20.42	105.80	35.37	193.44	94.02 to 102.78	65,243	63,286
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	76	97.89	106.37	96.38	21.26	110.36	61.03	364.33	91.53 to 103.78	71,034	68,465
<u>ALL</u>											
	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	16	104.24	99.64	96.56	20.14	103.19	48.36	148.26	84.92 to 117.63	43,365	41,875
HOWELLS	6	96.50	99.70	91.21	19.05	109.31	68.43	137.46	68.43 to 137.46	54,541	49,746
HOWELLS MH	1	364.33	364.33	364.33			364.33	364.33	N/A	4,500	16,395
LEIGH	9	121.93	119.05	114.91	17.49	103.59	79.57	169.19	90.88 to 138.81	35,055	40,283
LEIGH V	1	61.03	61.03	61.03			61.03	61.03	N/A	6,800	4,150
RICHLAND	1	35.37	35.37	35.37			35.37	35.37	N/A	36,500	12,910
ROGERS	2	106.46	106.46	91.29	26.56	116.62	78.18	134.74	N/A	53,950	49,250
RURAL	13	95.35	97.29	93.47	6.57	104.09	71.44	130.86	94.02 to 98.63	143,653	134,267
RURAL V	1	180.00	180.00	180.00			180.00	180.00	N/A	1,200	2,160
SCHUYLER	104	96.18	101.07	96.45	15.49	104.79	62.41	193.44	92.22 to 101.82	72,285	69,720
SCHUYLER SUB	6	88.27	88.95	87.17	13.84	102.04	72.71	105.26	72.71 to 105.26	144,233	125,722
SCHUYLER SUB V	4	84.84	84.46	83.03	9.93	101.72	71.82	96.34	N/A	27,500	22,833
SCHUYLER V	4	92.95	95.26	78.54	36.68	121.29	58.44	136.70	N/A	9,500	7,461
<u>ALL</u>											
	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	31.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.02 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	31.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.80 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.45	95% Mean C.I.:	97.24 to 106.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,337,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	19.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,482	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:52

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	143	97.25	102.92	96.55	20.10	106.60	35.37	364.33	93.05 to 102.05	62,923	60,751
2	10	84.84	87.15	86.70	12.61	100.52	71.82	105.26	72.71 to 101.46	97,540	84,567
3	15	96.44	103.82	94.02	12.59	110.42	71.44	180.00	95.02 to 104.35	127,913	120,258
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	158	96.82	102.44	95.51	18.28	107.26	35.37	364.33	94.96 to 100.28	74,279	70,946
2	10	84.84	95.99	81.72	34.07	117.46	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	15,600	12,749
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	166	96.39	100.66	95.33	17.55	105.58	35.37	193.44	94.02 to 99.38	71,283	67,958
06	1	72.71	72.71	72.71			72.71	72.71	N/A	54,500	39,625
07	1	364.33	364.33	364.33			364.33	364.33	N/A	4,500	16,395
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	11	121.93	119.31	114.02	23.18	104.64	61.03	180.00	79.57 to 169.19	29,409	33,533
19-0058	19	97.99	99.08	96.25	18.78	102.94	48.36	148.26	86.93 to 113.23	54,018	51,993
19-0059	11	98.86	126.68	99.25	38.18	127.64	68.43	364.33	81.39 to 137.46	76,159	75,586
19-0123	127	95.23	98.88	94.27	16.14	104.88	35.37	193.44	91.53 to 98.72	76,413	72,038
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	31.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.02 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	31.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.80 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.45	95% Mean C.I.:	97.24 to 106.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,337,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	19.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,482	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:52

YEAR BUILT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	10	84.84	95.99	81.72	34.07	117.46	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	15,600	12,749
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	14	100.02	103.24	94.17	20.59	109.63	49.64	143.26	79.57 to 131.23	41,307	38,898
1900 TO 1919	45	96.05	101.73	95.53	19.83	106.49	35.37	174.39	89.92 to 105.26	66,440	63,467
1920 TO 1939	16	99.87	104.01	99.66	14.84	104.36	76.38	167.66	85.44 to 112.11	61,384	61,176
1940 TO 1949	9	101.82	100.93	96.44	12.76	104.66	73.43	138.81	87.57 to 113.23	58,991	56,891
1950 TO 1959	15	95.21	106.70	101.23	18.01	105.40	79.77	193.44	88.96 to 112.48	61,863	62,627
1960 TO 1969	13	99.38	121.04	100.78	26.85	120.11	87.78	364.33	93.05 to 111.97	75,819	76,409
1970 TO 1979	28	91.88	95.31	93.17	13.84	102.29	68.43	169.19	84.17 to 102.49	88,128	82,113
1980 TO 1989	7	103.99	106.26	102.85	24.02	103.32	48.36	183.42	48.36 to 183.42	81,178	83,489
1990 TO 1994	4	99.13	98.69	99.30	3.46	99.39	92.53	103.98	N/A	84,125	83,538
1995 TO 1999	2	77.13	77.13	77.57	3.42	99.44	74.50	79.77	N/A	163,000	126,435
2000 TO Present	5	95.35	90.99	87.71	12.85	103.75	71.44	108.98	N/A	208,600	182,956
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	130.13	168.24	205.65	79.87	81.81	48.36	364.33	N/A	2,612	5,372
5000 TO 9999	3	122.00	106.58	101.70	20.67	104.80	61.03	136.70	N/A	5,600	5,695
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	122.00	141.81	141.56	57.54	100.18	48.36	364.33	48.36 to 364.33	3,892	5,510
10000 TO 29999	24	126.50	122.82	124.08	21.21	98.98	58.44	183.42	100.88 to 138.81	21,068	26,142
30000 TO 59999	43	103.78	104.77	103.32	19.16	101.41	35.37	193.44	96.05 to 112.48	44,963	46,455
60000 TO 99999	66	91.73	92.75	92.88	9.22	99.86	71.92	117.93	89.43 to 95.38	79,052	73,423
100000 TO 149999	17	96.30	93.79	93.66	9.59	100.13	68.43	108.98	83.78 to 103.98	115,552	108,230
150000 TO 249999	9	94.02	92.83	93.00	4.36	99.82	79.77	101.46	87.85 to 97.15	189,322	176,063
250000 TO 499999	2	74.59	74.59	74.64	4.22	99.92	71.44	77.73	N/A	270,000	201,540
ALL	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	31.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.02 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	31.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.80 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.45	95% Mean C.I.:	97.24 to 106.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,337,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	19.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,482	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:52

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	4	70.64	92.41	72.51	53.39	127.44	48.36	180.00	N/A	3,187	2,311
5000 TO 9999	3	122.00	107.53	96.63	19.89	111.29	63.90	136.70	N/A	6,666	6,441
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	7	80.25	98.89	87.24	47.25	113.36	48.36	180.00	48.36 to 180.00	4,678	4,081
10000 TO 29999	17	98.86	111.67	86.65	43.17	128.87	35.37	364.33	62.41 to 134.95	22,547	19,537
30000 TO 59999	59	98.51	107.92	101.06	21.29	106.79	71.82	183.42	95.13 to 113.23	45,761	46,246
60000 TO 99999	61	94.96	96.95	95.03	11.10	102.02	68.43	193.44	89.97 to 99.19	82,119	78,041
100000 TO 149999	13	100.28	97.57	96.37	7.30	101.24	74.50	111.97	87.85 to 104.35	117,769	113,494
150000 TO 249999	11	94.02	91.44	89.98	8.18	101.62	71.44	108.98	77.73 to 101.46	203,263	182,899
ALL _____											
	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605
20	69	98.63	108.68	98.77	25.90	110.03	35.37	364.33	93.82 to 111.50	55,450	54,767
30	86	95.28	97.87	94.46	12.19	103.61	71.44	193.44	92.34 to 100.28	85,524	80,785
40	2	87.89	87.89	82.95	11.55	105.95	77.73	98.04	N/A	185,000	153,450
ALL _____											
	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605
100	4	75.44	140.89	88.40	106.52	159.38	48.36	364.33	N/A	22,187	19,613
101	92	98.57	102.68	95.67	16.20	107.33	35.37	193.44	95.35 to 102.17	78,457	75,058
102	7	96.05	95.65	94.49	10.36	101.23	79.57	118.29	79.57 to 118.29	66,471	62,808
103	2	91.44	91.44	90.07	7.96	101.53	84.17	98.72	N/A	111,000	99,977
104	50	94.52	100.56	95.60	18.05	105.19	49.64	148.26	89.92 to 107.94	68,084	65,087
301	1	105.96	105.96	105.96			105.96	105.96	N/A	100,000	105,955
307	1	94.14	94.14	94.14			94.14	94.14	N/A	52,750	49,660
ALL _____											
	168	96.39	102.06	95.33	19.14	107.06	35.37	364.33	94.02 to 99.38	70,786	67,482

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	31.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.02 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	31.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.80 to 97.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.45	95% Mean C.I.:	97.24 to 106.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,337,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	19.14	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	67,482	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:52

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605
20	7	101.82	104.79	104.54	11.07	100.24	78.17	121.76	78.17 to 121.76	47,700	49,865
30	113	96.44	103.20	94.87	20.42	108.79	35.37	364.33	93.17 to 100.28	76,285	72,370
40	37	96.05	99.88	96.52	13.36	103.48	76.38	138.81	89.92 to 103.39	70,187	67,743
<u>ALL</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>96.39</u>	<u>102.06</u>	<u>95.33</u>	<u>19.14</u>	<u>107.06</u>	<u>35.37</u>	<u>364.33</u>	<u>94.02 to 99.38</u>	<u>70,786</u>	<u>67,482</u>

Colfax County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential

For the 2008 assessment year, the county conducted a market study of the Residential class of property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the class was at 96 percent, but the town of Clarkson was above the statutory range at 104 percent. The analysis of sold parcels in the town of Schuyler indicated that houses built after 1960 were not assessed at market value. The median assessment/sales ratio in the assessor location of Leigh was also outside the acceptable range with nine sales.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, the County completed the following assessment actions:

- In the town of Clarkson the improvement value for all residential properties was decreased by ten percent to move the median within the acceptable range at 95 percent.
- A drive-by review was conducted of the houses built after 1960 in Schuyler. Values were updated as necessary.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county. The county analyzed sales in the town of Leigh and determined that while the median was outside the acceptable range, there were not a sufficient number of sales to accurately determine that the median ratio represented the level of value in Leigh.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

2008 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contractor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contractor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2005
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2005
6.	What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	2005
7.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:
	6
8.	How are these defined?
	By town/village boundaries
9.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?
	Yes
10.	Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
	Yes

11.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	A suburban area is defined around the city of Schuyler. There is no suburban market influence around any other towns.
12.	Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
	Yes

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
69	56	0	125

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	28.84	95% Median C.I.:	95.23 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	29.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 98.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.62	95% Mean C.I.:	97.38 to 106.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,507,415						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,496	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:00

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	23	95.15	99.99	95.04	15.88	105.20	58.44	168.38	87.40 to 102.17	78,611	74,716
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	25	96.88	100.85	96.82	10.51	104.17	80.40	137.46	94.30 to 103.66	73,320	70,987
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	94.53	95.10	91.18	14.14	104.30	70.30	127.75	80.20 to 105.70	56,075	51,127
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	31	97.83	108.34	98.06	18.53	110.48	68.43	364.33	93.76 to 102.52	82,400	80,799
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	105.96	112.07	101.45	17.18	110.46	71.82	180.00	95.83 to 134.50	55,463	56,267
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	96.79	102.31	99.53	15.54	102.79	61.03	182.71	89.70 to 105.93	76,776	76,415
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	94.74	94.38	90.46	12.68	104.34	67.05	136.70	72.71 to 104.32	55,505	50,208
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	34	96.82	97.06	96.40	17.06	100.69	35.37	169.19	90.31 to 102.78	67,570	65,136
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	91	96.88	102.42	96.26	15.18	106.40	58.44	364.33	95.02 to 98.56	75,476	72,653
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	77	98.63	101.12	97.46	16.91	103.76	35.37	182.71	94.34 to 102.63	65,243	63,583
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	76	98.47	105.81	98.13	17.63	107.83	61.03	364.33	95.23 to 102.52	71,034	69,704
<u>ALL</u>											
	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	16	94.86	93.34	90.18	18.83	103.50	48.36	137.67	78.16 to 107.62	43,365	39,107
HOWELLS	6	97.57	100.31	91.78	18.22	109.29	68.43	137.46	68.43 to 137.46	54,541	50,058
HOWELLS MH	1	364.33	364.33	364.33			364.33	364.33	N/A	4,500	16,395
LEIGH	9	121.93	119.05	114.91	17.49	103.59	79.57	169.19	90.88 to 138.81	35,055	40,283
LEIGH V	1	61.03	61.03	61.03			61.03	61.03	N/A	6,800	4,150
RICHLAND	1	35.37	35.37	35.37			35.37	35.37	N/A	36,500	12,910
ROGERS	2	109.05	109.05	95.26	23.56	114.47	83.35	134.74	N/A	53,950	51,392
RURAL	13	95.95	100.73	96.51	7.49	104.37	87.49	130.86	94.02 to 104.35	143,653	138,640
RURAL V	1	180.00	180.00	180.00			180.00	180.00	N/A	1,200	2,160
SCHUYLER	104	97.39	100.95	97.81	11.30	103.21	64.75	182.71	95.21 to 100.88	72,285	70,701
SCHUYLER SUB	6	96.66	92.36	92.90	10.25	99.42	72.71	105.26	72.71 to 105.26	144,233	133,993
SCHUYLER SUB V	4	84.84	84.46	83.03	9.93	101.72	71.82	96.34	N/A	27,500	22,833
SCHUYLER V	4	92.95	95.26	78.54	36.68	121.29	58.44	136.70	N/A	9,500	7,461
<u>ALL</u>											
	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	28.84	95% Median C.I.:	95.23 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	29.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 98.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.62	95% Mean C.I.:	97.38 to 106.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,507,415						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,496	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:00

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	143	97.34	102.27	97.32	16.74	105.08	35.37	364.33	95.38 to 100.74	62,923	61,238
2	10	91.59	89.20	91.79	11.12	97.18	71.82	105.26	72.71 to 101.99	97,540	89,529
3	15	96.44	106.03	96.68	12.58	109.67	87.49	180.00	95.02 to 104.35	127,913	123,664
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	158	97.25	102.19	96.96	15.08	105.39	35.37	364.33	95.45 to 99.45	74,279	72,024
2	10	84.84	95.99	81.72	34.07	117.46	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	15,600	12,749
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	166	97.19	100.42	96.77	14.46	103.77	35.37	182.71	95.23 to 99.38	71,283	68,984
06	1	72.71	72.71	72.71			72.71	72.71	N/A	54,500	39,625
07	1	364.33	364.33	364.33			364.33	364.33	N/A	4,500	16,395
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	11	121.93	119.31	114.02	23.18	104.64	61.03	180.00	79.57 to 169.19	29,409	33,533
19-0058	19	95.95	95.29	93.33	17.38	102.10	48.36	137.67	80.20 to 107.62	54,018	50,416
19-0059	11	98.86	127.02	99.47	37.85	127.69	68.43	364.33	82.90 to 137.46	76,159	75,756
19-0123	127	96.34	99.11	96.32	12.45	102.89	35.37	182.71	94.40 to 99.38	76,413	73,600
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	28.84	95% Median C.I.:	95.23 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	29.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 98.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.62	95% Mean C.I.:	97.38 to 106.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,507,415						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,496	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:00

YEAR BUILT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	10	84.84	95.99	81.72	34.07	117.46	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	15,600	12,749
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	14	100.02	102.52	95.26	16.12	107.62	67.05	134.95	81.77 to 121.76	41,307	39,350
1900 TO 1919	45	95.83	101.77	96.51	17.13	105.45	35.37	168.38	94.04 to 104.35	66,440	64,120
1920 TO 1939	16	98.35	101.11	98.18	12.94	102.98	70.30	145.22	89.70 to 111.08	61,384	60,267
1940 TO 1949	9	101.82	101.19	97.38	10.98	103.91	80.97	138.81	87.57 to 105.93	58,991	57,444
1950 TO 1959	15	95.21	103.57	99.55	12.75	104.04	87.43	182.71	90.88 to 103.55	61,863	61,585
1960 TO 1969	13	98.72	118.69	99.11	25.32	119.77	87.78	364.33	92.98 to 107.35	75,819	75,140
1970 TO 1979	28	98.31	98.03	96.39	10.76	101.69	68.43	169.19	91.24 to 102.49	88,128	84,951
1980 TO 1989	7	97.24	99.92	101.79	17.92	98.17	48.36	140.17	48.36 to 140.17	81,178	82,627
1990 TO 1994	4	102.13	103.82	101.56	10.97	102.23	84.95	126.07	N/A	84,125	85,433
1995 TO 1999	2	82.26	82.26	82.03	1.69	100.28	80.87	83.65	N/A	163,000	133,712
2000 TO Present	5	95.95	96.57	95.45	5.09	101.17	87.49	103.66	N/A	208,600	199,107
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

SALE PRICE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	130.13	168.24	205.65	79.87	81.81	48.36	364.33	N/A	2,612	5,372
5000 TO 9999	3	122.00	106.58	101.70	20.67	104.80	61.03	136.70	N/A	5,600	5,695
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	122.00	141.81	141.56	57.54	100.18	48.36	364.33	48.36 to 364.33	3,892	5,510
10000 TO 29999	24	121.59	116.68	117.31	18.38	99.46	58.44	168.38	100.88 to 137.46	21,068	24,714
30000 TO 59999	43	100.95	103.01	101.76	17.78	101.23	35.37	182.71	96.27 to 108.17	44,963	45,754
60000 TO 99999	66	94.62	94.24	94.29	7.21	99.95	70.30	117.93	91.24 to 96.44	79,052	74,541
100000 TO 149999	17	98.32	95.69	95.61	6.94	100.08	68.43	105.96	89.95 to 103.66	115,552	110,481
150000 TO 249999	9	95.95	95.15	95.11	3.92	100.04	80.87	101.99	93.13 to 100.74	189,322	180,070
250000 TO 499999	2	90.63	90.63	90.69	3.46	99.93	87.49	93.76	N/A	270,000	244,855
ALL	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	28.84	95% Median C.I.:	95.23 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	29.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 98.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.62	95% Mean C.I.:	97.38 to 106.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,507,415						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,496	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:00

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	4	70.64	92.41	72.51	53.39	127.44	48.36	180.00	N/A	3,187	2,311	
5000 TO 9999	3	122.00	107.53	96.63	19.89	111.29	63.90	136.70	N/A	6,666	6,441	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	7	80.25	98.89	87.24	47.25	113.36	48.36	180.00	48.36 to 180.00	4,678	4,081	
10000 TO 29999	19	100.88	112.04	91.30	36.68	122.71	35.37	364.33	79.57 to 133.11	22,910	20,917	
30000 TO 59999	54	100.20	106.67	102.04	16.93	104.54	70.30	169.19	95.74 to 111.08	44,588	45,497	
60000 TO 99999	64	95.27	96.57	95.08	9.32	101.56	68.43	182.71	92.22 to 97.44	82,021	77,989	
100000 TO 149999	12	101.23	100.32	99.60	4.89	100.72	83.65	111.97	96.30 to 104.35	114,583	114,125	
150000 TO 249999	11	95.95	95.22	94.76	4.74	100.49	80.87	103.66	87.49 to 101.99	192,445	182,355	
250000 TO 499999	1	93.76	93.76	93.76			93.76	93.76	N/A	275,000	257,850	
<u>ALL</u>	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496	

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605	
20	69	98.63	106.76	98.41	21.60	108.49	35.37	364.33	95.38 to 104.32	55,450	54,566	
30	86	96.59	98.80	96.41	10.01	102.47	70.30	182.71	94.40 to 99.38	85,524	82,457	
40	2	93.97	93.97	93.87	0.22	100.10	93.76	94.17	N/A	185,000	173,655	
<u>ALL</u>	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496	

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605	
100	4	78.85	142.60	90.47	104.08	157.61	48.36	364.33	N/A	22,187	20,073	
101	92	98.43	102.02	97.31	12.93	104.84	35.37	182.71	95.74 to 100.95	78,457	76,344	
102	7	94.17	95.40	93.41	12.42	102.13	79.57	118.29	79.57 to 118.29	66,471	62,090	
103	2	98.52	98.52	98.48	0.20	100.04	98.32	98.72	N/A	111,000	109,317	
104	50	96.13	100.57	96.64	14.35	104.07	64.75	137.67	94.02 to 104.32	68,084	65,795	
301	1	105.96	105.96	105.96			105.96	105.96	N/A	100,000	105,955	
307	1	96.27	96.27	96.27			96.27	96.27	N/A	52,750	50,785	
<u>ALL</u>	168	97.19	101.83	96.77	16.07	105.23	35.37	364.33	95.23 to 99.38	70,786	68,496	

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	168	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	28.84	95% Median C.I.:	95.23 to 99.38
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,910,325	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	29.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.87 to 98.66
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,892,125	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.62	95% Mean C.I.:	97.38 to 106.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,507,415						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	70,786	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	364.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	68,496	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.37		

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:01

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	89.42	95.92	89.05	29.97	107.72	58.44	180.00	61.03 to 136.70	31,000	27,605
20	7	101.82	105.76	105.09	10.11	100.64	84.98	121.76	84.98 to 121.76	47,700	50,127
30	113	97.15	102.79	96.45	16.41	106.58	35.37	364.33	95.02 to 99.45	76,285	73,575
40	37	97.25	99.89	97.76	11.94	102.17	70.30	138.81	94.04 to 103.39	70,187	68,618
<u>ALL</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>97.19</u>	<u>101.83</u>	<u>96.77</u>	<u>16.07</u>	<u>105.23</u>	<u>35.37</u>	<u>364.33</u>	<u>95.23 to 99.38</u>	<u>70,786</u>	<u>68,496</u>

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The County made value changes as necessary in the residential class for 2008. The Assessor Location of Clarkson changed the most notable amount. The County analyzed the Assessor Location of Leigh but could not identify a sufficient number of sales to indicate an assessment level, so no assessment actions were taken. The statistics contained herein indicate all subclasses are valued within the statutory range.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	350	168	48
2007	350	188	53.71
2006	328	201	61.28
2005	321	211	65.73
2004	376	279	74.2
2003	373	287	76.94
2002	348	272	78.16
2001	376	282	75

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the sales utilization grid indicates the County has used a historically decreasing percentage of qualified sales for analysis purposes. A review of the non-qualified sales file indicates that several family transactions and private sales are present in the file. These types of transactions are appropriately coded as non-qualified sales. The Division assumes that while this percentage is generally low compared to surrounding counties, the measurement of the class has been done with all available arm's length sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio Continued

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	96.39	0.86	97.22	97.19
2007	91.28	4.82	95.68	96.39
2006	93.92	2.07	95.86	96.60
2005	93.69	5.1	98.47	97.08
2004	89.39	5.14	93.99	94.06
2003	91	2.76	93.51	94
2002	95	0.71	95.67	95
2001	90	6.25	95.63	96

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0.47	2008	0.86
8.06	2007	4.82
2.52	2006	2.07
8.69	2005	5.1
6.64	2004	5.14
3	2003	3
0.29	2002	0.71
5.89	2001	6.25

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

2008 Correlation Section for Colfax County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for “direct” equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for “indirect” equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county’s assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97.19	96.77	101.83

RESIDENTIAL: The median ratio and weighted mean ratio are within the acceptable range.
The mean is slightly outside the acceptable range.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	16.07	105.23
Difference	1.07	2.23

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. Although these quality statistics improved since the preliminary statistics, they do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	168	168	0
Median	96.39	97.19	0.8
Wgt. Mean	95.33	96.77	1.44
Mean	102.06	101.83	-0.23
COD	19.14	16.07	-3.07
PRD	107.06	105.23	-1.83
Min Sales Ratio	35.37	35.37	0
Max Sales Ratio	364.33	364.33	0

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:59

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	2	114.74	114.74	113.66	1.58	100.95	112.92	116.55	N/A	24,750	28,130
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
<u>Study Years</u>											
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05											
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	99.13	99.13	99.13			99.13	99.13	N/A	32,000	31,720
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	98.85	98.85	98.80	0.11	100.05	98.75	98.96	N/A	24,250	23,960
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	95.41	95.41	99.96	7.46	95.45	88.30	102.53	N/A	36,600	36,585
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	45,000	43,680
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	106.03	103.83	99.88	10.29	103.96	86.72	116.55	N/A	32,875	32,835
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.75	93.61	93.68	6.82	99.93	79.52	102.53	N/A	34,340	32,170
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	96.68	96.68	96.74	0.40	99.94	96.29	97.07	N/A	38,750	37,487
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	2	97.52	97.52	97.58	1.26	99.93	96.29	98.75	N/A	34,250	33,422
RURAL V	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
SCHUYLER	6	99.04	98.35	97.76	6.57	100.61	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	39,833	38,941
SCHUYLER V	2	102.43	102.43	100.47	13.79	101.94	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,600	11,655
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	10	98.85	99.00	97.92	7.10	101.11	79.52	116.55	88.30 to 112.92	33,070	32,380
3	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
<u>ALL</u>											
	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:59

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	8	98.85	98.15	97.72	5.30	100.43	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	38,437	37,561
2	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	10	98.85	99.00	97.92	7.10	101.11	79.52	116.55	88.30 to 112.92	33,070	32,380
04	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039											
19-0058	2	97.52	97.52	97.58	1.26	99.93	96.29	98.75	N/A	34,250	33,422
19-0059											
19-0123	9	98.96	97.97	96.19	8.93	101.84	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,688	33,368
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:59

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	100.83	100.83	101.34	1.69	99.49	99.13	102.53	N/A	46,000	46,617
1920 TO 1939	1	112.92	112.92	112.92			112.92	112.92	N/A	39,500	44,605
1940 TO 1949	4	96.68	92.96	90.79	5.23	102.39	79.52	98.96	N/A	35,000	31,776
1950 TO 1959	1	98.75	98.75	98.75			98.75	98.75	N/A	36,000	35,550
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	98.96	101.27	99.94	9.52	101.33	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,900	11,893
30000 TO 59999	7	97.07	95.77	94.73	7.10	101.10	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	40,714	38,567
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	98.96	101.27	99.94	9.52	101.33	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,900	11,893
30000 TO 59999	7	97.07	95.77	94.73	7.10	101.10	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	40,714	38,567
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:00:59

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223	
20	8	98.85	98.15	97.72	5.30	100.43	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	38,437	37,561	
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223	
326	1	98.96	98.96	98.96			98.96	98.96	N/A	12,500	12,370	
353	2	100.83	100.83	101.34	1.69	99.49	99.13	102.53	N/A	46,000	46,617	
406	2	105.00	105.00	104.48	7.55	100.49	97.07	112.92	N/A	42,250	44,142	
471	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760	
528	1	98.75	98.75	98.75			98.75	98.75	N/A	36,000	35,550	
555	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295	
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378	

Colfax County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

No changes to the commercial and industrial class of property were reported for 2008. The County conducted a market analysis of this class of property and determined the median was within the acceptable range for the class and that no individual valuation groupings had a representative number of sales to indicate an adjustment was necessary.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

2008 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contractor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contractor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contractor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2005
5.	What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2007
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2007
7.	When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
	2007
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?
	6
9.	How are these defined?
	By town/village boundaries
10.	Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?
	Yes
11.	Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
	Yes

12.	What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	A suburban area is defined around the city of Schuyler. There is no suburban market influence around any other towns.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
12	2	0	14

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:04

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	2	114.74	114.74	113.66	1.58	100.95	112.92	116.55	N/A	24,750	28,130
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05											
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	1	99.13	99.13	99.13			99.13	99.13	N/A	32,000	31,720
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	98.85	98.85	98.80	0.11	100.05	98.75	98.96	N/A	24,250	23,960
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	95.41	95.41	99.96	7.46	95.45	88.30	102.53	N/A	36,600	36,585
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	97.07	97.07	97.07			97.07	97.07	N/A	45,000	43,680
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295
Study Years											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	4	106.03	103.83	99.88	10.29	103.96	86.72	116.55	N/A	32,875	32,835
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	98.75	93.61	93.68	6.82	99.93	79.52	102.53	N/A	34,340	32,170
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	96.68	96.68	96.74	0.40	99.94	96.29	97.07	N/A	38,750	37,487
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	98.96	98.95	98.93	0.13	100.02	98.75	99.13	N/A	26,833	26,546
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	92.69	91.85	93.11	8.57	98.65	79.52	102.53	N/A	42,050	39,152
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CLARKSON	2	97.52	97.52	97.58	1.26	99.93	96.29	98.75	N/A	34,250	33,422
RURAL V	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
SCHUYLER	6	99.04	98.35	97.76	6.57	100.61	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	39,833	38,941
SCHUYLER V	2	102.43	102.43	100.47	13.79	101.94	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,600	11,655
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	10	98.85	99.00	97.92	7.10	101.11	79.52	116.55	88.30 to 112.92	33,070	32,380
3	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:04

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	8	98.85	98.15	97.72	5.30	100.43	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	38,437	37,561
2	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	10	98.85	99.00	97.92	7.10	101.11	79.52	116.55	88.30 to 112.92	33,070	32,380
04	1	86.72	86.72	86.72			86.72	86.72	N/A	50,000	43,360
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039											
19-0058	2	97.52	97.52	97.58	1.26	99.93	96.29	98.75	N/A	34,250	33,422
19-0059											
19-0123	9	98.96	97.97	96.19	8.93	101.84	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,688	33,368
27-0046											
27-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:04

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	100.83	100.83	101.34	1.69	99.49	99.13	102.53	N/A	46,000	46,617
1920 TO 1939	1	112.92	112.92	112.92			112.92	112.92	N/A	39,500	44,605
1940 TO 1949	4	96.68	92.96	90.79	5.23	102.39	79.52	98.96	N/A	35,000	31,776
1950 TO 1959	1	98.75	98.75	98.75			98.75	98.75	N/A	36,000	35,550
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	98.96	101.27	99.94	9.52	101.33	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,900	11,893
30000 TO 59999	7	97.07	95.77	94.73	7.10	101.10	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	40,714	38,567
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	3	98.96	101.27	99.94	9.52	101.33	88.30	116.55	N/A	11,900	11,893
30000 TO 59999	7	97.07	95.77	94.73	7.10	101.10	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	40,714	38,567
60000 TO 99999	1	102.53	102.53	102.53			102.53	102.53	N/A	60,000	61,515
ALL	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	10.99	95% Median C.I.:	86.72 to 112.92	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	380,700	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	10.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.74 to 104.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	380,700	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.47	95% Mean C.I.:	90.66 to 105.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	367,165							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	34,609	COD:	7.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.55			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,378	PRD:	101.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	79.52			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:04

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223	
20	8	98.85	98.15	97.72	5.30	100.43	79.52	112.92	79.52 to 112.92	38,437	37,561	
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	88.30	97.19	91.08	11.26	106.71	86.72	116.55	N/A	24,400	22,223	
326	1	98.96	98.96	98.96			98.96	98.96	N/A	12,500	12,370	
353	2	100.83	100.83	101.34	1.69	99.49	99.13	102.53	N/A	46,000	46,617	
406	2	105.00	105.00	104.48	7.55	100.49	97.07	112.92	N/A	42,250	44,142	
471	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	50,000	39,760	
528	1	98.75	98.75	98.75			98.75	98.75	N/A	36,000	35,550	
555	1	96.29	96.29	96.29			96.29	96.29	N/A	32,500	31,295	
____ALL____	11	98.75	97.89	96.44	7.57	101.49	79.52	116.55	86.72 to 112.92	34,609	33,378	

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. There are very few commercial sales in this class, but a sufficient amount to determine a representative level of value.

There were no assessment actions reported for the commercial class in 2008 and the statistics reflect that report. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	74	11	14.86
2007	82	15	18.29
2006	88	30	34.09
2005	89	34	38.2
2004	95	48	50.53
2003	89	45	50.56
2002	87	55	63.22
2001	76	42	55.26

COMMERCIAL: A review of the sales utilization grid indicates the County has used a historically decreasing percentage of qualified sales for analysis purposes. A further review of the non-qualified sales file indicates that several private transactions, sales from corporate affiliates to parent companies, and sales involving excess amounts of personal property are present in the file. These types of transactions are appropriately coded as non-qualified sales. The Division assumes that while this percentage is generally low compared to surrounding counties, the measurement of the class has been done with all available arm's length sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudeans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio Continued

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	98.75	-0.25	98.51	98.75
2007	86.72	3.85	90.05	98.96
2006	95.30	0.31	95.59	95.58
2005	96.47	0.56	97.01	96.47
2004	97.32	4.71	101.9	97.32
2003	99	5.58	104.52	99
2002	80	15.19	92.15	98
2001	92	0.24	92.22	92

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2008	-0.25
17.91	2007	3.85
-1.8	2006	0.31
0	2005	0.56
0	2004	4.71
0	2003	6
41.98	2002	15.19
0.4	2001	0.24

COMMERCIAL: No change in the sale base and minimal percent change in the population supports the assessment actions reported by the county that there was no change to the class of property for 2008 other than pickup work of new and omitted construction.

2008 Correlation Section for Colfax County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for “direct” equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for “indirect” equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county’s assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98.75	96.44	97.89

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	7.57	101.49
Difference	0	0

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	11	11	0
Median	98.75	98.75	0
Wgt. Mean	96.44	96.44	0
Mean	97.89	97.89	0
COD	7.57	7.57	0
PRD	101.49	101.49	0
Min Sales Ratio	79.52	79.52	0
Max Sales Ratio	116.55	116.55	0

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	20.91	95% Median C.I.:	62.61 to 70.33	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	14.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 75.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.39	95% Mean C.I.:	63.99 to 71.27	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,799,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	15.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,478	PRD:	99.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.12			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:01:18

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	2	83.90	83.90	83.79	0.46	100.13	83.51	84.28	N/A	224,400	188,017
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	72.31	80.19	82.01	23.13	97.77	55.00	121.12	N/A	77,961	63,938
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	9	68.25	69.25	84.65	12.80	81.81	55.93	100.71	56.48 to 76.73	257,405	217,892
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	7	65.39	66.80	68.31	10.82	97.79	50.45	86.58	50.45 to 86.58	163,384	111,610
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	58.91	61.82	56.32	16.81	109.75	43.84	89.77	51.56 to 71.67	200,232	112,781
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	69.97	66.30	59.60	12.27	111.25	43.12	84.72	43.12 to 84.72	217,100	129,381
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	60.71	64.06	60.82	13.62	105.33	53.33	78.14	N/A	145,333	88,390
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	56.93	56.93	56.94	3.35	99.98	55.02	58.84	N/A	314,999	179,370
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	65.87	65.57	65.14	7.97	100.66	55.25	72.05	N/A	119,406	77,779
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	68.47	70.60	67.15	20.07	105.14	50.74	97.15	50.74 to 97.15	261,113	175,330
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	68.57	68.57	67.50	5.50	101.59	64.80	72.35	N/A	146,641	98,990
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	22	69.02	71.79	79.94	15.49	89.81	50.45	121.12	61.93 to 76.73	191,863	153,367
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	64.39	63.84	58.15	16.34	109.78	43.12	89.77	53.33 to 70.64	198,815	115,620
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	64.80	66.83	64.71	13.69	103.28	50.74	97.15	56.60 to 72.35	205,799	133,173
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	26	64.29	65.73	70.85	14.15	92.78	43.84	100.71	56.48 to 70.28	210,102	148,850
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	67.54	64.68	60.23	12.92	107.38	43.12	84.72	55.25 to 72.05	188,879	113,770
<u>ALL</u>											
	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	20.91	95% Median C.I.:	62.61 to 70.33	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	14.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 75.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.39	95% Mean C.I.:	63.99 to 71.27	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,799,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	15.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,478	PRD:	99.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.12			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:01:18

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2069	2	69.29	69.29	68.78	4.93	100.74	65.87	72.70	N/A	183,688	126,335	
2071	5	64.18	62.32	60.14	6.25	103.62	52.98	68.94	N/A	151,246	90,965	
2073	5	55.93	57.69	56.39	12.12	102.32	48.87	76.73	N/A	205,340	115,782	
2111	5	63.98	77.25	74.22	27.20	104.07	55.50	121.12	N/A	171,600	127,369	
2113	4	61.00	65.43	67.74	15.78	96.58	55.00	84.72	N/A	110,603	74,926	
2115	2	80.39	80.39	83.36	7.70	96.44	74.20	86.58	N/A	142,000	118,365	
2353	11	70.28	68.42	67.19	5.66	101.84	50.74	78.14	61.58 to 72.35	140,727	94,550	
2355	9	72.05	66.77	62.48	14.73	106.87	43.12	84.28	55.25 to 82.18	136,827	85,485	
2357	7	70.64	69.86	61.16	19.98	114.23	43.84	97.15	43.84 to 97.15	249,975	152,874	
2399	1	53.33	53.33	53.33			53.33	53.33	N/A	192,000	102,390	
2401	3	70.33	80.08	93.36	14.93	85.78	69.21	100.71	N/A	536,083	500,478	
2403	4	60.39	59.76	60.38	4.68	98.97	55.02	63.24	N/A	354,715	214,168	
ALL												
	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	35	69.66	67.86	68.92	13.54	98.47	43.12	100.71	62.61 to 71.67	221,382	152,572	
2	23	64.18	67.28	65.86	16.66	102.15	48.87	121.12	56.48 to 72.70	162,379	106,942	
ALL												
	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	
ALL												
	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	20	68.10	69.61	66.51	16.68	104.66	48.87	121.12	62.12 to 74.20	153,775	102,280	
DRY-N/A	14	70.01	69.80	69.58	9.92	100.32	55.93	84.72	60.71 to 82.18	148,190	103,108	
GRASS	3	55.50	66.76	79.24	20.88	84.25	55.00	89.77	N/A	23,333	18,488	
GRASS-N/A	2	58.81	58.81	59.21	5.31	99.32	55.69	61.93	N/A	63,669	37,700	
IRRGTD	13	64.39	64.26	61.90	14.71	103.82	43.12	97.15	53.33 to 70.64	236,533	146,408	
IRRGTD-N/A	6	62.11	66.63	74.38	21.64	89.58	51.56	100.71	51.56 to 100.71	510,111	379,404	
ALL												
	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	20.91	95% Median C.I.:	62.61 to 70.33	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	14.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 75.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.39	95% Mean C.I.:	63.99 to 71.27	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,799,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	15.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,478	PRD:	99.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.12			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:01:18

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	29	70.33	70.36	68.25	14.59	103.10	48.87	121.12	63.98 to 74.20	152,093	103,802
DRY-N/A	5	68.94	65.79	64.75	7.37	101.60	56.60	72.35	N/A	147,893	95,768
GRASS	3	55.50	66.76	79.24	20.88	84.25	55.00	89.77	N/A	23,333	18,488
GRASS-N/A	2	58.81	58.81	59.21	5.31	99.32	55.69	61.93	N/A	63,669	37,700
IRRGTD	17	64.39	65.41	68.76	17.03	95.13	43.12	100.71	53.33 to 70.64	333,917	229,587
IRRGTD-N/A	2	61.63	61.63	60.30	14.04	102.21	52.98	70.28	N/A	229,500	138,380
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	33	70.33	70.09	68.19	13.38	102.78	48.87	121.12	64.18 to 72.70	150,110	102,360
DRY-N/A	1	56.60	56.60	56.60			56.60	56.60	N/A	196,514	111,230
GRASS	4	58.72	65.55	70.47	17.54	93.02	55.00	89.77	N/A	35,459	24,988
GRASS-N/A	1	55.69	55.69	55.69			55.69	55.69	N/A	55,500	30,910
IRRGTD	19	64.39	65.01	68.12	16.66	95.43	43.12	100.71	53.33 to 70.28	322,926	219,986
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	1	74.20	74.20	74.20			74.20	74.20	N/A	74,000	54,910
19-0058	8	67.41	70.55	70.85	11.40	99.58	56.60	86.58	56.60 to 86.58	156,140	110,624
19-0059	9	55.93	57.96	57.81	9.95	100.26	48.87	76.73	50.45 to 63.98	205,300	118,681
19-0123	38	69.44	69.11	69.82	15.72	98.99	43.12	121.12	62.12 to 71.92	207,184	144,647
27-0046											
27-0595	2	68.03	68.03	67.17	5.35	101.28	64.39	71.67	N/A	219,634	147,535
NonValid School											
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	20.91	95% Median C.I.:	62.61 to 70.33	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	14.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 75.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.39	95% Mean C.I.:	63.99 to 71.27	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,799,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	15.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,478	PRD:	99.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.12			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:01:18

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
10.01 TO 30.00	3	55.69	60.61	60.23	9.06	100.63	55.50	70.64	N/A	36,254	21,835
30.01 TO 50.00	23	65.39	67.04	64.17	14.71	104.48	43.84	121.12	61.58 to 71.92	110,543	70,936
50.01 TO 100.00	23	69.21	68.47	65.36	13.93	104.76	43.12	97.15	60.71 to 72.70	196,471	128,417
100.01 TO 180.00	5	70.35	70.66	66.87	16.27	105.67	48.87	86.58	N/A	310,760	207,793
180.01 TO 330.00	2	57.40	57.40	57.03	10.17	100.64	51.56	63.24	N/A	764,728	436,152
650.01 +	1	100.71	100.71	100.71			100.71	100.71	N/A	1,228,250	1,236,975
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
10000 TO 29999	1	55.50	55.50	55.50			55.50	55.50	N/A	20,000	11,100
30000 TO 59999	3	70.64	72.03	71.36	16.08	100.95	55.69	89.77	N/A	45,754	32,648
60000 TO 99999	12	71.99	74.91	74.02	11.63	101.20	61.93	121.12	64.18 to 78.14	80,315	59,452
100000 TO 149999	13	65.39	64.79	65.38	10.96	99.09	50.45	84.72	55.93 to 70.33	125,023	81,741
150000 TO 249999	17	70.28	68.74	68.49	14.07	100.37	43.84	97.15	56.60 to 76.73	193,372	132,433
250000 TO 499999	8	56.93	58.84	57.73	15.53	101.92	43.12	83.51	43.12 to 83.51	336,278	194,140
500000 +	3	63.24	71.84	76.49	25.91	93.92	51.56	100.71	N/A	919,235	703,093
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478

PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	20.91	95% Median C.I.:	62.61 to 70.33	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	14.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 75.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.39	95% Mean C.I.:	63.99 to 71.27	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,799,725							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	15.49	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,478	PRD:	99.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.12			

Printed: 02/09/2008 12:01:18

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$ _____												
1 TO 4999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825	
10000 TO 29999	2	63.07	63.07	64.95	12.00	97.10	55.50	70.64	N/A	26,631	17,297	
30000 TO 59999	8	66.56	66.85	65.36	13.21	102.28	50.45	89.77	50.45 to 89.77	73,161	47,820	
60000 TO 99999	19	68.25	68.49	65.42	14.29	104.70	43.84	121.12	60.71 to 72.05	115,587	75,618	
100000 TO 149999	14	70.28	67.31	66.03	11.49	101.93	50.74	84.72	53.33 to 73.70	185,497	122,490	
150000 TO 249999	11	64.39	67.95	64.42	20.24	105.47	43.12	97.15	48.87 to 86.58	299,293	192,803	
250000 TO 499999	2	57.40	57.40	57.03	10.17	100.64	51.56	63.24	N/A	764,728	436,152	
500000 +	1	100.71	100.71	100.71			100.71	100.71	N/A	1,228,250	1,236,975	
ALL	58	67.06	67.63	67.92	15.49	99.57	43.12	121.12	62.61 to 70.33	197,984	134,478	

Colfax County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural

For the 2008 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be below the statutory range at 67.06%. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the two market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Colfax County completed the following assessment actions:

- In Market Area One, the irrigated average acre value increased by 6.52 percent, and the average dry per acre value increased 1.28 percent. Values in the grass category were not changed from the prior years' values.
- In Market Area Two, the irrigated average acre value increased by 11.5 percent, and the average dry per acre value increased 11 percent. Values in the grass category were not changed from the prior years' values.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

2008 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contractor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contractor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By land use
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1982, with a conversion completed in 1995
7.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	1983
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Taxpayer notification and irrigation reports
b.	By whom?
	Staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	89%
8.	Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class:
	2

9.	How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class?
	Areas are defined by sales, township boundaries and water availability
10.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
25	34	0	59

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.33	95% Median C.I.:	66.80 to 73.09	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.11 to 81.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.60	95% Mean C.I.:	67.98 to 75.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,346,105							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	14.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.45			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,898	PRD:	98.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.93			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:13

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/04 TO 09/30/04	2	88.61	88.61	89.62	4.00	98.88	85.07	92.16	N/A	224,400	201,107
10/01/04 TO 12/31/04	4	76.81	85.77	88.97	28.40	96.40	55.00	134.45	N/A	77,961	69,363
01/01/05 TO 03/31/05	9	72.11	74.78	90.76	12.12	82.40	62.12	107.41	62.76 to 85.24	257,405	233,609
04/01/05 TO 06/30/05	7	71.59	72.65	74.39	10.65	97.66	56.06	96.19	56.06 to 96.19	163,384	121,534
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	10	63.97	64.84	60.23	15.69	107.65	46.69	89.77	54.90 to 76.42	200,232	120,609
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	73.66	71.48	64.39	14.06	111.02	45.93	93.76	45.93 to 93.76	217,100	139,780
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	66.64	67.64	64.76	11.42	104.44	56.72	79.55	N/A	145,333	94,120
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	60.00	60.00	60.01	3.38	99.98	57.97	62.03	N/A	314,999	189,045
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.59	67.52	68.10	7.26	99.15	55.65	73.09	N/A	119,406	81,314
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	70.94	73.77	70.72	18.09	104.31	54.11	102.54	54.11 to 102.54	261,113	184,663
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	73.30	73.30	72.93	1.80	100.51	71.98	74.62	N/A	146,641	106,940
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/04 TO 06/30/05	22	72.78	77.36	86.07	15.82	89.88	55.00	134.45	65.27 to 85.07	191,863	165,131
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	68.98	67.77	62.43	15.31	108.54	45.93	93.76	56.72 to 76.42	198,815	124,128
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	71.98	69.79	68.24	12.09	102.27	54.11	102.54	61.89 to 74.62	205,799	140,434
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/05 TO 12/31/05	26	70.75	70.38	76.14	13.23	92.44	46.69	107.41	62.76 to 72.98	210,102	159,973
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	71.77	68.46	64.28	12.74	106.52	45.93	93.76	57.97 to 73.99	188,879	121,403
<u>ALL</u>											
	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.33	95% Median C.I.:	66.80 to 73.09	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.11 to 81.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.60	95% Mean C.I.:	67.98 to 75.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,346,105							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	14.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.45			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,898	PRD:	98.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.93			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:13

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2069	2	76.91	76.91	76.34	4.96	100.74	73.09	80.72	N/A	183,688	140,222	
2071	5	70.96	69.05	66.76	6.28	103.43	59.37	76.31	N/A	151,246	100,975	
2073	5	62.12	64.10	62.64	12.12	102.32	54.30	85.24	N/A	205,340	128,632	
2111	5	70.86	84.39	82.00	28.83	102.91	55.50	134.45	N/A	171,600	140,718	
2113	4	67.28	70.83	74.68	18.41	94.84	55.00	93.76	N/A	110,603	82,603	
2115	2	89.32	89.32	92.61	7.69	96.45	82.45	96.19	N/A	142,000	131,505	
2353	11	72.90	71.11	70.05	5.15	101.51	54.11	79.55	65.27 to 74.62	140,727	98,581	
2355	9	72.59	67.82	63.92	14.09	106.09	45.93	85.07	55.65 to 82.18	136,827	87,465	
2357	7	70.64	72.79	64.78	19.94	112.36	46.69	102.54	46.69 to 102.54	249,975	161,933	
2399	1	56.72	56.72	56.72			56.72	56.72	N/A	192,000	108,905	
2401	3	77.13	85.95	99.67	14.73	86.24	73.32	107.41	N/A	536,083	534,306	
2403	4	63.44	62.91	63.69	4.59	98.78	57.97	66.80	N/A	354,715	225,917	
ALL												
	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	35	72.11	70.52	72.54	13.01	97.22	45.93	107.41	65.27 to 73.99	221,382	160,588	
2	23	70.96	74.06	72.98	17.49	101.49	54.30	134.45	62.12 to 80.72	162,379	118,499	
ALL												
	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	
ALL												
	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY	20	73.00	75.10	72.07	16.16	104.21	54.11	134.45	63.69 to 80.72	153,775	110,826	
DRY-N/A	14	72.09	74.23	74.78	8.84	99.26	61.89	93.76	66.64 to 82.18	148,190	110,823	
GRASS	3	55.50	66.76	79.24	20.88	84.25	55.00	89.77	N/A	23,333	18,488	
GRASS-N/A	2	61.22	61.22	61.68	5.94	99.24	57.58	64.85	N/A	63,669	39,272	
IRRGTD	13	68.56	67.76	65.52	14.07	103.42	45.93	102.54	56.72 to 74.17	236,533	154,967	
IRRGTD-N/A	6	66.35	71.16	79.38	20.72	89.65	54.90	107.41	54.90 to 107.41	510,111	404,910	
ALL												
	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.33	95% Median C.I.:	66.80 to 73.09	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.11 to 81.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.60	95% Mean C.I.:	67.98 to 75.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,346,105							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	14.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.45			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,898	PRD:	98.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.93			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:13

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	29	72.66	75.53	73.89	14.35	102.22	54.11	134.45	70.86 to 80.72	152,093	112,378
DRY-N/A	5	71.59	70.21	68.84	6.26	101.98	61.89	76.31	N/A	147,893	101,816
GRASS	3	55.50	66.76	79.24	20.88	84.25	55.00	89.77	N/A	23,333	18,488
GRASS-N/A	2	61.22	61.22	61.68	5.94	99.24	57.58	64.85	N/A	63,669	39,272
IRRGTD	17	68.56	69.09	72.99	16.58	94.66	45.93	107.41	56.72 to 74.17	333,917	243,716
IRRGTD-N/A	2	66.68	66.68	65.55	10.96	101.73	59.37	73.99	N/A	229,500	150,430
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	33	72.66	75.13	73.61	13.14	102.07	54.11	134.45	70.94 to 77.13	150,110	110,498
DRY-N/A	1	61.89	61.89	61.89			61.89	61.89	N/A	196,514	121,615
GRASS	4	60.18	66.28	71.95	18.33	92.12	55.00	89.77	N/A	35,459	25,513
GRASS-N/A	1	57.58	57.58	57.58			57.58	57.58	N/A	55,500	31,955
IRRGTD	19	68.56	68.83	72.43	15.96	95.03	45.93	107.41	57.97 to 73.99	322,926	233,896
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
19-0039	1	82.45	82.45	82.45			82.45	82.45	N/A	74,000	61,015
19-0058	8	74.70	78.11	78.45	11.56	99.56	61.89	96.19	61.89 to 96.19	156,140	122,500
19-0059	9	62.12	63.65	64.12	10.78	99.27	54.30	85.24	55.50 to 70.86	205,300	131,628
19-0123	38	72.35	72.28	73.75	15.41	98.01	45.93	134.45	65.27 to 73.99	207,184	152,791
27-0046											
27-0595	2	72.49	72.49	71.56	5.42	101.29	68.56	76.42	N/A	219,634	157,177
NonValid School											
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.33	95% Median C.I.:	66.80 to 73.09	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.11 to 81.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.60	95% Mean C.I.:	67.98 to 75.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,346,105							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	14.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.45			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,898	PRD:	98.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.93			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:13

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
10.01 TO 30.00	3	57.58	61.24	61.19	8.76	100.08	55.50	70.64	N/A	36,254	22,183
30.01 TO 50.00	23	70.96	71.01	67.99	13.17	104.45	46.69	134.45	63.69 to 72.90	110,543	75,160
50.01 TO 100.00	23	73.99	73.28	70.09	13.03	104.55	45.93	102.54	66.64 to 77.13	196,471	137,714
100.01 TO 180.00	5	71.59	77.02	73.26	17.65	105.13	54.30	96.19	N/A	310,760	227,658
180.01 TO 330.00	2	60.85	60.85	60.48	9.78	100.61	54.90	66.80	N/A	764,728	462,517
650.01 +	1	107.41	107.41	107.41			107.41	107.41	N/A	1,228,250	1,319,280
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825
10000 TO 29999	1	55.50	55.50	55.50			55.50	55.50	N/A	20,000	11,100
30000 TO 59999	3	70.64	72.66	72.12	15.19	100.76	57.58	89.77	N/A	45,754	32,996
60000 TO 99999	12	72.75	78.62	77.32	12.86	101.69	63.69	134.45	70.94 to 82.18	80,315	62,098
100000 TO 149999	13	72.11	69.87	70.46	10.08	99.16	55.65	93.76	62.12 to 74.62	125,023	88,091
150000 TO 249999	17	73.32	73.61	73.38	13.84	100.30	46.69	102.54	61.89 to 85.07	193,372	141,905
250000 TO 499999	8	60.70	63.90	62.75	15.66	101.83	45.93	92.16	45.93 to 92.16	336,278	211,013
500000 +	3	66.80	76.37	81.38	26.20	93.84	54.90	107.41	N/A	919,235	748,105
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898

PAD 2008 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified
 Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.33	95% Median C.I.:	66.80 to 73.09	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,793,802	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.11 to 81.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,483,111	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.60	95% Mean C.I.:	67.98 to 75.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,346,105							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,984	COD:	14.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.45			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,898	PRD:	98.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.93			

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:20:13

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$ _____												
1 TO 4999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	1	55.00	55.00	55.00			55.00	55.00	N/A	1,500	825	
10000 TO 29999	2	63.07	63.07	64.95	12.00	97.10	55.50	70.64	N/A	26,631	17,297	
30000 TO 59999	5	70.96	71.89	71.36	12.30	100.75	57.58	89.77	N/A	63,758	45,497	
60000 TO 99999	17	72.59	73.50	71.17	13.45	103.28	55.65	134.45	62.76 to 79.55	98,017	69,754	
100000 TO 149999	17	72.98	71.24	70.05	10.85	101.69	46.69	93.76	61.89 to 77.13	171,605	120,215	
150000 TO 249999	10	70.83	72.42	69.21	19.28	104.64	45.93	102.54	57.97 to 96.19	262,845	181,915	
250000 TO 499999	5	66.80	67.80	64.26	16.11	105.51	54.30	92.16	N/A	533,851	343,057	
500000 +	1	107.41	107.41	107.41			107.41	107.41	N/A	1,228,250	1,319,280	
ALL	58	71.79	71.93	72.68	14.77	98.96	45.93	134.45	66.80 to 73.09	197,984	143,898	

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Considering the analyses in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency.

The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the two market areas are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the class exists. The assessment practices employed by the County are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2008	196	58	29.59
2007	196	60	30.61
2006	194	57	29.38
2005	222	69	31.08
2004	216	68	31.48
2003	197	72	36.55
2002	203	78	38.42
2001	209	94	44.98

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used chart displays that 29.59 percent of the available sales were used for the development of the qualified unimproved agricultural sales file. This percentage is relatively low compared to most counties in the state, but consistent with counties surrounding Colfax County. A majority of the disqualified sales are family transactions and are appropriately coded as non-qualified. It is assumed that the County has used all available arm's length sales.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudeans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio Continued

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2008	67.06	7.52	72.1	71.79
2007	65.23	4.7	68.29	69.87
2006	61.86	22.79	75.96	74.91
2005	71.98	6.2	76.44	76.14
2004	71.80	7.43	77.14	77.87
2003	72	3.37	74.43	76
2002	73	1.19	73.87	75
2001	70	6.34	74.44	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary median ratio and the Reports and Opinions median ratio are similar, indicating the assessment actions are applied to the sold parcels and the population in a similar manner.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales		% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)
5.46	2008	7.52
7.45	2007	4.7
23.36	2006	22.79
9.51	2005	6.2
11.62	2004	7.43
3	2003	3
1.59	2002	1.19
8.47	2001	6.34

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

2008 Correlation Section for Colfax County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for “direct” equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for “indirect” equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county’s assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71.79	72.68	71.93

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller “spread” or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	14.77	98.96
Difference	0	0

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2008 Correlation Section
for Colfax County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	58	58	0
Median	67.06	71.79	4.73
Wgt. Mean	67.92	72.68	4.76
Mean	67.63	71.93	4.3
COD	15.49	14.77	-0.72
PRD	99.57	98.96	-0.61
Min Sales Ratio	43.12	45.93	2.81
Max Sales Ratio	121.12	134.45	13.33

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. Several per acre value increases were implemented in the agricultural class of property for 2008.

County 19 - Colfax

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 7,985	Value 797,104,553	Total Growth 3,498,355 (Sum 17, 25, & 41)
--	----------------------	--------------------------	---

Schedule I: Non-Agricultural Records (Res and Rec)

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
1. Res UnImp Land	325	1,548,720	82	1,200,535	2	2,380	409	2,751,635	
2. Res Improv Land	2,460	12,705,660	58	1,341,200	211	3,538,360	2,729	17,585,220	
3. Res Improvements	2,619	139,055,870	63	8,034,400	279	20,876,885	2,961	167,967,155	
4. Res Total	2,944	153,310,250	145	10,576,135	281	24,417,625	3,370	188,304,010	1,772,975
% of Total	87.35	81.41	4.30	5.61	8.33	12.96	42.20	23.62	50.68
5. Rec UnImp Land	1	5,180	3	8,175	30	317,860	34	331,215	
6. Rec Improv Land	0	0	21	165,000	17	262,245	38	427,245	
7. Rec Improvements	0	0	61	901,195	20	953,040	81	1,854,235	
8. Rec Total	1	5,180	64	1,074,370	50	1,533,145	115	2,612,695	97,375
% of Total	0.86	0.19	55.65	41.12	43.47	58.68	1.44	0.32	2.78
Res+Rec Total	2,945	153,315,430	209	11,650,505	331	25,950,770	3,485	190,916,705	1,870,350
% of Total	84.50	80.30	5.99	6.10	9.49	13.59	43.64	23.95	53.46

County 19 - Colfax

Total Real Property Value (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30)	Records 7,985	Value 797,104,553	Total Growth 3,498,355 (Sum 17, 25, & 41)
--	----------------------	--------------------------	---

Schedule I: Non-Agricultural Records (Com and Ind)

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
9. Comm UnImp Land	68	544,715	5	182,000	6	176,035	79	902,750	
10. Comm Improv Land	423	3,715,545	26	854,475	19	378,005	468	4,948,025	
11. Comm Improvements	432	32,041,566	29	5,787,425	22	3,347,845	483	41,176,836	
12. Comm Total	500	36,301,826	34	6,823,900	28	3,901,885	562	47,027,611	225,160
% of Total	88.96	77.19	6.04	14.51	4.98	8.29	7.03	5.89	6.43
13. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Ind Improv Land	0	0	2	419,700	0	0	2	419,700	
15. Ind Improvements	0	0	2	29,896,160	0	0	2	29,896,160	
16. Ind Total	0	0	2	30,315,860	0	0	2	30,315,860	0
% of Total	0.00	0.00	***	***	0.00	0.00	0.02	3.80	0.00
Comm+Ind Total	500	36,301,826	36	37,139,760	28	3,901,885	564	77,343,471	225,160
% of Total	88.65	46.93	6.38	48.01	4.96	5.04	7.06	9.70	6.43
17. Taxable Total	3,445	189,617,256	245	48,790,265	359	29,852,655	4,049	268,260,176	2,095,510
% of Total	85.08	70.68	6.05	4.34	8.86	9.67	50.70	33.65	59.89

County 19 - Colfax

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule II: Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	14,390	938,455	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	14,390	938,455
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	14,390	938,455

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total		Growth			
	Records	Value	Records	Value		
23. Mineral Interest-Producing	0	0	0	0		
24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing	0	0	0	0		
25. Mineral Interest Total	0	0	0	0		

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	228	0	206	434

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	6	323,930	8	901,735	2,868	308,609,300	2,882	309,834,965
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	2	93,805	1,031	134,044,750	1,033	134,138,555
29. Ag-Improvements	0	0	1	28,545	1,053	84,842,312	1,054	84,870,857
30. Ag-Total Taxable							3,936	528,844,377

County 19 - Colfax

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:

Non-Agricultural Detail	Urban			SubUrban			Growth Value
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.000	0	1	1.000	10,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0		0	1		28,345	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0	
37. FarmSite Improv	0		0	1		200	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches		0.000			9.000		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		0.000	0		0.000	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	4	7.000	70,000	4	7.000	70,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	770	781.450	7,830,000	771	782.450	7,840,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	730		58,287,690	731		58,316,035	1,402,845
34. HomeSite Total				735	789.450	66,226,035	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	33	78.100	156,200	33	78.100	156,200	
36. FarmSite Impr Land	919	3,486.910	6,973,820	919	3,486.910	6,973,820	
37. FarmSite Improv	1,012		26,554,622	1,013		26,554,822	921,530
38. FarmSite Total				1,046	3,565.010	33,684,842	
39. Road & Ditches		5,409.880			5,418.880		
40. Other-Non Ag Use		231.170	346,755		231.170	346,755	
41. Total Section VI				1,781	10,004.510	100,257,632	2,324,375

Schedule VII: Agricultural Records:

Ag Land Detail-Game & Parks	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0

Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records:

Special Value	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
44. Recapture Val			0			0
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.000	0	0	0.000	0
44. Recapture Val			0			0

County 19 - Colfax

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	33.620	92,120	8,872.160	24,309,705	8,905.780	24,401,825
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,507.370	21,821,450	8,507.370	21,821,450
47. 2A1	54.200	126,830	0.000	0	13,762.210	32,203,590	13,816.410	32,330,420
48. 2A	0.000	0	55.000	120,450	7,356.420	16,110,580	7,411.420	16,231,030
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,615.680	9,623,720	4,615.680	9,623,720
50. 3A	74.000	142,080	50.500	96,960	11,743.450	22,547,400	11,867.950	22,786,440
51. 4A1	0.000	0	24.000	33,360	1,992.470	2,769,535	2,016.470	2,802,895
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	101.940	112,135	101.940	112,135
53. Total	128.200	268,910	163.120	342,890	56,951.700	129,498,115	57,243.020	130,109,915
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	29.350	58,700	3,373.530	6,735,565	3,402.880	6,794,265
55. 1D	0.000	0	0.000	0	8,506.210	16,581,450	8,506.210	16,581,450
56. 2D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,256.380	7,895,710	4,256.380	7,895,710
57. 2D	0.000	0	23.800	41,055	2,396.880	4,136,755	2,420.680	4,177,810
58. 3D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,180.780	6,884,520	4,180.780	6,884,520
59. 3D	0.000	0	6.000	9,570	7,956.980	12,712,700	7,962.980	12,722,270
60. 4D1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,958.160	3,847,730	2,958.160	3,847,730
61. 4D	0.000	0	10.750	10,750	840.720	848,595	851.470	859,345
62. Total	0.000	0	69.900	120,075	34,469.640	59,643,025	34,539.540	59,763,100
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	5.740	5,165	522.030	468,745	527.770	473,910
64. 1G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,327.910	1,081,440	1,327.910	1,081,440
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,596.670	1,268,795	1,596.670	1,268,795
66. 2G	0.000	0	24.260	18,210	2,586.200	2,045,510	2,610.460	2,063,720
67. 3G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,359.830	1,062,330	1,359.830	1,062,330
68. 3G	2.000	1,540	31.000	22,030	7,097.210	5,327,630	7,130.210	5,351,200
69. 4G1	0.000	0	2.730	1,910	3,504.450	2,367,135	3,507.180	2,369,045
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	5,230.640	2,941,030	5,230.640	2,941,030
71. Total	2.000	1,540	63.730	47,315	23,224.940	16,562,615	23,290.670	16,611,470
72. Waste	0.000	0	16.250	815	2,623.920	131,205	2,640.170	132,020
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		23.150		23.150	
75. Total	130.200	270,450	313.000	511,095	117,270.200	205,834,960	117,713.400	206,616,505

County 19 - Colfax

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

Market Area: 2

Irrigated:	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
45. 1A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	811.900	1,968,870	811.900	1,968,870
46. 1A	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,997.990	6,910,405	2,997.990	6,910,405
47. 2A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,077.050	2,391,050	1,077.050	2,391,050
48. 2A	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,232.740	2,490,135	1,232.740	2,490,135
49. 3A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	953.720	1,840,680	953.720	1,840,680
50. 3A	0.000	0	0.000	0	4,293.040	7,985,060	4,293.040	7,985,060
51. 4A1	0.000	0	0.000	0	790.130	1,003,465	790.130	1,003,465
52. 4A	0.000	0	0.000	0	30.000	31,200	30.000	31,200
53. Total	0.000	0	0.000	0	12,186.570	24,620,865	12,186.570	24,620,865
Dryland:								
54. 1D1	0.000	0	10.000	24,000	3,043.350	7,281,985	3,053.350	7,305,985
55. 1D	2.040	4,530	55.000	122,100	24,638.800	54,638,960	24,695.840	54,765,590
56. 2D1	7.200	15,805	0.000	0	3,859.650	8,460,440	3,866.850	8,476,245
57. 2D	4.610	9,195	0.000	0	4,391.370	8,758,755	4,395.980	8,767,950
58. 3D1	0.000	0	5.000	9,525	10,557.370	20,110,665	10,562.370	20,120,190
59. 3D	2.000	3,690	113.480	209,370	38,026.430	70,163,635	38,141.910	70,376,695
60. 4D1	17.000	20,230	67.190	79,955	14,147.790	16,872,160	14,231.980	16,972,345
61. 4D	0.000	0	3.000	3,000	803.980	811,420	806.980	814,420
62. Total	32.850	53,450	253.670	447,950	99,468.740	187,098,020	99,755.260	187,599,420
Grass:								
63. 1G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	145.600	120,125	145.600	120,125
64. 1G	0.000	0	14.140	11,030	3,940.190	3,063,565	3,954.330	3,074,595
65. 2G1	0.000	0	0.000	0	2,058.710	1,472,225	2,058.710	1,472,225
66. 2G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,557.620	988,325	1,557.620	988,325
67. 3G1	0.000	0	16.000	8,240	1,037.850	531,445	1,053.850	539,685
68. 3G	0.000	0	4.700	2,185	4,633.160	2,145,875	4,637.860	2,148,060
69. 4G1	0.000	0	12.000	5,040	2,074.150	870,815	2,086.150	875,855
70. 4G	0.000	0	0.000	0	1,185.970	486,255	1,185.970	486,255
71. Total	0.000	0	46.840	26,495	16,633.250	9,678,630	16,680.090	9,705,125
72. Waste	0.630	30	0.000	0	895.870	44,800	896.500	44,830
73. Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
74. Exempt	0.000		0.000		10.820		10.820	
75. Total	33.480	53,480	300.510	474,445	129,184.430	221,442,315	129,518.420	221,970,240

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76.Irrigated	128.200	268,910	163.120	342,890	69,138.270	154,118,980	69,429.590	154,730,780
77.Dry Land	32.850	53,450	323.570	568,025	133,938.380	246,741,045	134,294.800	247,362,520
78.Grass	2.000	1,540	110.570	73,810	39,858.190	26,241,245	39,970.760	26,316,595
79.Waste	0.630	30	16.250	815	3,519.790	176,005	3,536.670	176,850
80.Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
81.Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	33.970	0	33.970	0
82.Total	163.680	323,930	613.510	985,540	246,454.630	427,277,275	247,231.820	428,586,745

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 19 - Colfax

Market Area: 1

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	8,905.780	15.56%	24,401,825	18.75%	2,739.998
1A	8,507.370	14.86%	21,821,450	16.77%	2,565.005
2A1	13,816.410	24.14%	32,330,420	24.85%	2,340.001
2A	7,411.420	12.95%	16,231,030	12.47%	2,190.002
3A1	4,615.680	8.06%	9,623,720	7.40%	2,085.005
3A	11,867.950	20.73%	22,786,440	17.51%	1,919.997
4A1	2,016.470	3.52%	2,802,895	2.15%	1,390.000
4A	101.940	0.18%	112,135	0.09%	1,100.009
Irrigated Total	57,243.020	100.00%	130,109,915	100.00%	2,272.939

Dry:

1D1	3,402.880	9.85%	6,794,265	11.37%	1,996.621
1D	8,506.210	24.63%	16,581,450	27.75%	1,949.334
2D1	4,256.380	12.32%	7,895,710	13.21%	1,855.029
2D	2,420.680	7.01%	4,177,810	6.99%	1,725.882
3D1	4,180.780	12.10%	6,884,520	11.52%	1,646.707
3D	7,962.980	23.05%	12,722,270	21.29%	1,597.677
4D1	2,958.160	8.56%	3,847,730	6.44%	1,300.717
4D	851.470	2.47%	859,345	1.44%	1,009.248
Dry Total	34,539.540	100.00%	59,763,100	100.00%	1,730.280

Grass:

1G1	527.770	2.27%	473,910	2.85%	897.947
1G	1,327.910	5.70%	1,081,440	6.51%	814.392
2G1	1,596.670	6.86%	1,268,795	7.64%	794.650
2G	2,610.460	11.21%	2,063,720	12.42%	790.557
3G1	1,359.830	5.84%	1,062,330	6.40%	781.222
3G	7,130.210	30.61%	5,351,200	32.21%	750.496
4G1	3,507.180	15.06%	2,369,045	14.26%	675.484
4G	5,230.640	22.46%	2,941,030	17.70%	562.269
Grass Total	23,290.670	100.00%	16,611,470	100.00%	713.224

Irrigated Total	57,243.020	48.63%	130,109,915	62.97%	2,272.939
Dry Total	34,539.540	29.34%	59,763,100	28.92%	1,730.280
Grass Total	23,290.670	19.79%	16,611,470	8.04%	713.224
Waste	2,640.170	2.24%	132,020	0.06%	50.004
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	23.150	0.02%			
Market Area Total	117,713.400	100.00%	206,616,505	100.00%	1,755.250

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	57,243.020	82.45%	130,109,915	84.09%	
Dry Total	34,539.540	25.72%	59,763,100	24.16%	
Grass Total	23,290.670	58.27%	16,611,470	63.12%	
Waste	2,640.170	74.65%	132,020	74.65%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	23.150	68.15%			
Market Area Total	117,713.400	47.61%	206,616,505	48.21%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 19 - Colfax

Market Area: **2**

Irrigated:	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
1A1	811.900	6.66%	1,968,870	8.00%	2,425.015
1A	2,997.990	24.60%	6,910,405	28.07%	2,305.012
2A1	1,077.050	8.84%	2,391,050	9.71%	2,219.999
2A	1,232.740	10.12%	2,490,135	10.11%	2,020.000
3A1	953.720	7.83%	1,840,680	7.48%	1,930.000
3A	4,293.040	35.23%	7,985,060	32.43%	1,860.001
4A1	790.130	6.48%	1,003,465	4.08%	1,269.999
4A	30.000	0.25%	31,200	0.13%	1,040.000
Irrigated Total	12,186.570	100.00%	24,620,865	100.00%	2,020.327

Dry:

1D1	3,053.350	3.06%	7,305,985	3.89%	2,392.776
1D	24,695.840	24.76%	54,765,590	29.19%	2,217.603
2D1	3,866.850	3.88%	8,476,245	4.52%	2,192.028
2D	4,395.980	4.41%	8,767,950	4.67%	1,994.538
3D1	10,562.370	10.59%	20,120,190	10.73%	1,904.893
3D	38,141.910	38.24%	70,376,695	37.51%	1,845.127
4D1	14,231.980	14.27%	16,972,345	9.05%	1,192.549
4D	806.980	0.81%	814,420	0.43%	1,009.219
Dry Total	99,755.260	100.00%	187,599,420	100.00%	1,880.596

Grass:

1G1	145.600	0.87%	120,125	1.24%	825.034
1G	3,954.330	23.71%	3,074,595	31.68%	777.526
2G1	2,058.710	12.34%	1,472,225	15.17%	715.120
2G	1,557.620	9.34%	988,325	10.18%	634.509
3G1	1,053.850	6.32%	539,685	5.56%	512.107
3G	4,637.860	27.80%	2,148,060	22.13%	463.157
4G1	2,086.150	12.51%	875,855	9.02%	419.842
4G	1,185.970	7.11%	486,255	5.01%	410.006
Grass Total	16,680.090	100.00%	9,705,125	100.00%	581.838

Irrigated Total	12,186.570	9.41%	24,620,865	11.09%	2,020.327
Dry Total	99,755.260	77.02%	187,599,420	84.52%	1,880.596
Grass Total	16,680.090	12.88%	9,705,125	4.37%	581.838
Waste	896.500	0.69%	44,830	0.02%	50.005
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	10.820	0.01%			
Market Area Total	129,518.420	100.00%	221,970,240	100.00%	1,713.812

As Related to the County as a Whole

Irrigated Total	12,186.570	17.55%	24,620,865	15.91%	
Dry Total	99,755.260	74.28%	187,599,420	75.84%	
Grass Total	16,680.090	41.73%	9,705,125	36.88%	
Waste	896.500	25.35%	44,830	25.35%	
Other	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Exempt	10.820	31.85%			
Market Area Total	129,518.420	52.39%	221,970,240	51.79%	

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 19 - Colfax

AgLand	Urban		SubUrban		Rural	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
Irrigated	128.200	268,910	163.120	342,890	69,138.270	154,118,980
Dry	32.850	53,450	323.570	568,025	133,938.380	246,741,045
Grass	2.000	1,540	110.570	73,810	39,858.190	26,241,245
Waste	0.630	30	16.250	815	3,519.790	176,005
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0	0.000	0
Exempt	0.000	0	0.000	0	33.970	0
Total	163.680	323,930	613.510	985,540	246,454.630	427,277,275

AgLand	Total Acres	Total Value	Total Acres	% of Acres*	Total Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	69,429.590	154,730,780	69,429.590	28.08%	154,730,780	36.10%	2,228.599
Dry	134,294.800	247,362,520	134,294.800	54.32%	247,362,520	57.72%	1,841.936
Grass	39,970.760	26,316,595	39,970.760	16.17%	26,316,595	6.14%	658.396
Waste	3,536.670	176,850	3,536.670	1.43%	176,850	0.04%	50.004
Other	0.000	0	0.000	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.000
Exempt	33.970	0	33.970	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.000
Total	247,231.820	428,586,745	247,231.820	100.00%	428,586,745	100.00%	1,733.542

* Department of Property Assessment & Taxation Calculates

**2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the
2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)**

19 Colfax

	2007 CTL County Total	2008 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2007 Form 45 - 2006 CTL)	Percent Change	2008 Growth (New Construction Value)	% Change excl. Growth
1. Residential	185,412,279	188,304,010	2,891,731	1.56	1,772,975	0.6
2. Recreational	2,023,500	2,612,695	589,195	29.12	97,375	24.31
3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings	65,827,740	66,226,035	398,295	0.61	*-----	0.61
4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	253,263,519	257,142,740	3,879,221	1.53	1,870,350	0.79
5. Commercial	46,992,401	47,027,611	35,210	0.07	225,160	-0.4
6. Industrial	30,315,860	30,315,860	0	0	0	0
7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	32,878,517	33,684,842	806,325	2.45	2,324,375	-4.62
8. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	110,186,778	111,028,313	841,535	0.76	1,146,690	-0.28
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	363,450,297	368,517,808	5,067,511	1.39	4,419,885	0.18
11. Irrigated	142,242,090	154,730,780	12,488,690	8.78		
12. Dryland	229,655,340	247,362,520	17,707,180	7.71		
13. Grassland	26,524,490	26,316,595	-207,895	-0.78		
14. Wasteland	180,205	176,850	-3,355	-1.86		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	398,602,125	428,586,745	29,984,620	7.52		
17. Total Value of All Real Property (Locally Assessed)	762,052,422	797,104,553	35,052,131	4.6	4,419,885	4.02

*Growth is not typically identified separately within a parcel between ag-residential dwellings (line 3) and ag outbuildings (line 7), so for this display, all growth from ag-residential dwellings and ag outbuildings is shown in line 7.

COLFAX COUNTY ASSESSOR
VIOLA M. BENDER
411 E. 11TH STREET
SCHUYLER, NE. 68661

June 1, 2007

I, Viola M. Bender, duly elected assessor of Colfax County, present this plan of assessment, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, to the Colfax County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year and to the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

Respectively Submitted

Colfax County Assessor
Viola M. Bender

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COUNTY

Based on the counties abstract
Colfax County has a total parcel count of 8,315 parcels.

Residential-----	3,404
Commercial-----	557
Agricultural-----	3,926
Exempt-----	428

Colfax County also processes approximately 1,100 Personal Property filings and 500 Homestead Exemptions each year.

The Colfax County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, Deputy Assessor, one full time clerk, and one part time Appraiser.

Budget

2007 General Budget: 117,848

The general budget includes the salaries for the administrative personal, educational classes, office supplies, office equipment and the data processing costs.

Procedures Manual

Colfax County has a written policy manual, which is updated each year.

Responsibilities

Record maintenance: Cadastral Maps

The office staff maintains the maps by keeping the ownership and descriptions current (Reg 10-004.03).

Property Record Cards: The office staff maintains the property record cards by keeping current the required legal, ownership, classification codes and changes made to the assessment information of the property (Reg. 10-004).

Report Generation

County Abstract of Assessment Report for Real Property must be completed and certified by the county assessor on or before March 19, to the Property Tax Administrator (Reg. 60-004.03), (Statute 77-1514).

Certification of Values: Pursuant to section 13-509 and 13-518 the county assessor must certify taxable valuations to political subdivisions on or before August 20 of each year.

School District Taxable Value Report: Pursuant to Section 79-1016 the assessor on or before Aug. 25, shall provide the current values, by property class, for the county, school districts and supplement TIF information if applicable, to the Property Tax Administrator.

Tax List Corrections: Tax list corrections are generated to correct clerical error (77-128) and any overvalued, undervalued, and omitted real property.

Generate Tax Roll: The assessor's office will on or before November 22 completes and deliver to the county treasurer the Tax List.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: On or before December 1 of each year the assessor will certify to the Property Tax Administrator, the total taxable valuation and the Certificate of Taxes Levied.

As of July 1, 2004 MIPS/County Solutions LLC of 725 S. 14th Street Lincoln, NE. 68508 will maintain all of our administrative programs.

Homestead Exemptions

The assessor's office on or before June 30 of each year, accepts applications for Homestead Exemption (77-3510 thru 77-3528). The assessor's office staff also helps the applicant complete the necessary forms.

Filing for Personal Property

The assessor's office on or before February 1 of each year sends a letter to all persons with personal property, explaining the procedure for filing Personal Property, the penalties for late filing and requesting they bring in or mail their depreciation worksheets to the assessor's office. We then complete the Personal Property Schedule and return a copy to the taxpayer.

Real Property

Residential: In 2007 Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. completed the rural reappraisal. The new values were applied to the property and valuation notices were sent out by June 1, 2007. For the 2008 tax year Colfax County will be reviewing the sales and other residential property in the city of Schuyler. We will also continue to review the sales in the counties other cities and villages and address any problem areas. In the 2009 tax year we will be working on new computer drawings of the residential properties. We will continue to review sales and address any problem areas. For the 2010 tax year we will be reviewing the sales and doing drive-by reviews in the towns of Clarkson, Howells and Leigh.

When doing a drive-by review if we feel there is a discrepancy in the square footage, addition or property updated, we will re-measure and recalculate the square footage.

The 2007 level of value is Assessment Ratio: 96, COD: 15.24 and the PRD: 104.78

Computerized

Colfax County now has all properties in the county data entered into the CAMA 200 for pricing. New digital photo's of all residential property was taken spring of 2007.

Commercial Property

For the 2007 assessment year the assessor's office did a complete review of all commercial property. In 2008 we will be making new property record cards and entering new digital photo's. We will continue to review sales and address any problem areas. For the 2009 assessment year we will be working on new computer drawings, also we will continue to review to review our sales. In the 2010 assessment year we will be doing a drive-by review of all commercial property and reviewing sales. The 2007 level of value is, Assessment Ratio: 99, COD: 9.86 and the PRD: 100.20

Agricultural

Our agricultural land use was last completed in 1983; we are unable to get land use verification from our local FSA office. We have two market areas in the county. In 1999 the county had aerial flights taken, which were used to review improvement information that was on the property card, if any discrepancies were found, we then physically reviewed the property. For 2007 the level of value was Assessment Ratio: 70, COD: 16.36 and the PRD: 100.08

Colfax and Butler County have established a new boundary line between the two counties. In 2004 we reviewed the legal descriptions of land along the new boundary between Colfax and Butler County.

The Assessor's office receives yearly updated well registration list, which also helps us track any changes in agland.

In the assessment years ahead we plan on continuing reviewing our agland sales, and

keeping the land use and classifications as current as possible.

Pick-up Work

Pick-up work is started in August of each year and completed by February 1. We receive Building permits monthly from the city clerks. The county in 1999 implemented zoning, which requires a zoning permit before any construction can be started, the zoning office will then submit a copy of this permit to the assessor's office, which helps us tract new construction in the rural areas.

Sales Review

Real Estate Transfers (Form 521) are delivered to the assessor's office each month from the clerk's office. The assessor and the deputy complete the Real Estate Transfer Statements. The assessor or deputy does verification of sales information by contacting the buyer or seller by telephone or in person. If no response from buyer or seller we try to contact the abstractor or the realtor involved in the sales.

The assessor and appraiser complete drive by reviews checking for changes that are different than the current property record card. Things we look for are additional buildings, heating & cooling changes, also changes in square footage (additions to house).

2008 Assessment Survey for Colfax County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$117,849
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$11,400
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	n/a
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	The contract appraiser is paid \$22,140
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None

13.	Total budget
	\$117,849
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS Inc.
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS Inc.
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS Inc.

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Clarkson, Howells, Richland, and Schuyler

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Kaiser Appraisal Services, contract 1/1/08 thru 12/31/08 Stanard Appraisal, Rural Reappraisal completed for 2007
2.	Other services

Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

- Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.
- One copy to the Colfax County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 7006 2760 0000 6387 5517.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

Valuation History Charts